



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,657	01/08/2002	Timothy E. Bennett	088305-0141	8992

7590 04/04/2006
William T. Ellis
Foley & Lardner
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5143

EXAMINER

WASEL, MOHAMED A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/038,657	BENNETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mohamed Wasel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5, 10 and 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 & 16-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to Amendment filed on January 4, 2006.

Claims 5, 10 and 15 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended.

Claims 16-21 have been newly added.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-21 are presented for examination

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Applicant states steps of extracting data and storing the extracted data in a memory. However, Applicant fails to state in the body of claim 1 the step(s) of **generating an EDI document**.

Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter U.S. Patent No. 5,878,419 in view of Wotring et al, (Wotring) U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0010700 and in further view of Chen et al, (Chen) U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0111964.

1. As per claim 1, Carter discloses extracting segments, transaction sets, functional groups, and attributes from an EDI document and assigning unique tags to the extracted data elements of the EDI document (*col. 2 lines 27-31, col.3 lines 18-55, col. 6 lines 40-60, col. 12 lines 60-67*).

Carter fails to explicitly disclose storing the extracted data elements in a hierarchical manner wherein the extracted data elements are linked in the memory with a common attribute.

Wotring discloses storing the extracted data elements in a hierarchical manner wherein the extracted data elements are linked in the memory with a common attribute (*Paragraph [0034-0035] & [0065-0066]*).

Therefore, at the time of applicant's invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter and Wotring to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16 because it would provide an efficient method of retrieving extracted data elements of an EDI document since the extracted data elements are linked and stored in the memory in a hierarchical manner.

Art Unit: 2154

2. As per claim 2, Carter teaches the method further comprising:

extracting at least one segment from the EDI document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col. 6 lines 40-52, col. 8 lines 55-60*).

3. As per claim 3, Carter teaches the method further comprising:

extracting at least one transaction set from the EDI document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.1 lines 33-41, col. 2 lines 7-18, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

4. As per claim 4, Carter teaches the method further comprising:

extracting at least one functional group from the EDI document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

5. As per claim 6, Carter discloses extracting segments, transaction sets, functional groups, and attributes from an EDI document and assigning unique tags to the extracted data elements of the EDI document (*col. 2 lines 27-31, col.3 lines 18-55, col. 6 lines 40-60, col. 12 lines 60-67*).

Carter fails to explicitly disclose storing the extracted data elements in a hierarchical manner wherein the extracted data elements are linked in the memory with a common attribute.

Wotring discloses storing the extracted data elements in a hierarchical manner wherein the extracted data elements are linked in the memory with a common attribute (*Paragraph [0034-0035] & [0065-0066]*).

Therefore, at the time of applicant's invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter and Wotring to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16 because it would provide an efficient method of retrieving extracted data elements of an EDI document since the extracted data elements are linked and stored in the memory in a hierarchical manner.

6. As per claim 7, Carter teaches the system further comprising:

a second data extractor that extracts at least one segment from the EDI document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col. 6 lines 40-52, col. 8 lines 55-60*).

7. As per claim 8, Carter teaches the system further comprising:

a second data extractor that extracts at least one transaction set from the EDI document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.1 lines 33-41, col. 2 lines 7-18, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

8. As per claim 9, Carter teaches a system further comprising:

a second data extractor that extracts at least one functional group from the EDI document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

Art Unit: 2154

9. As per claim 11, Carter discloses extracting segments, transaction sets, functional groups, and attributes from an EDI document and assigning unique tags to the extracted data elements of the EDI document (*col. 2 lines 27-31, col.3 lines 18-55, col. 6 lines 40-60, col. 12 lines 60-67*).

Carter fails to explicitly disclose storing the extracted data elements in a hierarchical manner wherein the extracted data elements are linked in the memory with a common attribute.

Wotring discloses storing the extracted data elements in a hierarchical manner wherein the extracted data elements are linked in the memory with a common attribute (*Paragraph [0034-0035] & [0065-0066]*).

Therefore, at the time of applicant's invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter and Wotring to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16 because it would provide an efficient method of retrieving extracted data elements of an EDI document since the extracted data elements are linked and stored in the memory in a hierarchical manner.

10. As per claim 12, Carter teaches the computer readable data storage medium having program code recorded thereon according to claim 11, further comprising:

extracting at least one segment from the EDI document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col. 6 lines 40-52, col. 8 lines 55-60*).

11. As per claim 13, Carter teaches the computer readable data storage medium having program code recorded thereon further comprising:

extracting at least one transaction set from the EDT document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDT document stored in the memory (*col.1 lines 33-41, col. 2 lines 7-18, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

12. As per claim 14, Carter teaches the computer readable data storage medium having program code recorded thereon comprising:

extracting at least one functional group from the EDI document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDT document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

13. As per claim 16, Carter discloses grouping transaction sets into Functional Groups which in turn can be packaged in an Interchange Envelope (*col. 6 lines 52-60*).

Carter fails to explicitly disclose providing graphical user interface (GUI) and allowing further editing of the EDI document by the user.

Chen discloses providing graphical user interface (GUI) and allowing further editing of the EDI document by using a text editor or more advanced graphical user interface editor (*Abstract, Paragraph [0011], [0041] & [0045]*).

Therefore, at the time of applicant's invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter and Chen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16 because it would provide an efficient way of generating/modifying an EDI document based upon user preferences.

Art Unit: 2154

14. As per claim 17, Carter discloses creating links between data elements in an EDI document and tagging each data element with a unique tag that identifies the context of a transaction (*col. 2 lines 27-31, col. 9 lines 1-35*).

Carter fails to explicitly disclose storing segments, transaction sets and functional groups extracted from the EDI document in the memory.

Wotring discloses storing extracted data elements of an EDI document in a hierarchical structure in the memory (*Paragraph [0015], [0018-0019], [0034] & [0065-0066]*).

Therefore, at the time of applicant's invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter and Wotring to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17 because it would provide an optimized method of retrieving EDI documents from a memory and enable a user to regenerate a customizable EDI documents that fits the user's preferences and needs.

15. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 16.

16. Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under the same reasoning and rationale as claim 17.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the

Art Unit: 2154


mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Wasel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MW
March 24, 2006

 **JOHN FOLLANSBEE**
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100